DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 335 CE 039 582

AUTHOR Knight, G. Diane; Sedlacek, William E.
TITLE Sex-Role Identity and Attitudes toward Women in Traditional and Non-Traditional Occupations. Research Report #4-83.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 28p.; For a related document, see CE 039 586.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; *College Students; *Females; Higher Education; Identification (Psychology); Males; *Nontraditional Occupations; *Role Perception; Sex Bias; Sex Discrimination; Sex Fairness; *Sex Role; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study examined the extent to which college students differentially evaluated women in traditional, nontraditional, and unspecified occupations. It also investigated whether sex-role identification was a variable moderating the attitudes of students toward the kinds of occupations women selected. The Situational Attitude Scale for Women in Occupations and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) were administered to 124 freshman university students. Students were classified as masculine sex-typed males, feminine sex-typed females, androgynous, or undifferentiated, using the BSRI. Data analyzed using two-way analysis of variance of occupational designation (form) and sex-role identification (role) yielded 18 items significantly different on role, 12 significantly different on form, and 4 significantly different on interaction of role and form. Results indicated women identified with nontraditional occupations were viewed less favorably than women identified with traditional occupations. Students with an androgynous self-concept were more likely to view women in any occupation more favorably. Masculine sex-typed males were most likely to hold negative attitudes toward women in any occupation and particularly toward women in nontraditional occupations. Results suggested that sex-role orientation had an impact on women's occupational choice and attitudes of male peers influenced women's career choice. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

ED248335

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W Sedlacek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SEX-ROLE IDENTITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN IN TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL OCCUPATIONS

G. Diane Knight and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 4-83

CE039582

Computer time for this project has been provided in full through the Computer Science Center of the University of Maryland.

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

SEX-ROLE IDENTITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN IN TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL OCCUPATIONS

G. Diane Knight and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 4-83

SUMMARY

The Situational Attitude Scale for Women in Occupations (SASW-OC) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) were administered to 124 freshmen university students. Students were classified as masculine sex-typed males, feminine sex-typed females, androgynous, or undifferentiated, using the BSRI. Data analyzed using two-way analyses of variance of occupational designation (Form) and sex-role identification (Role) yielded 18 items significantly different on role, 12 items significantly different on form, and 4 significantly different on interaction of role and form. Results indicated that women identified with non-traditional occupations were viewed less favorably than women identified with traditional occupations. Students with an androgynous self-concept were more likely to view women in any occupation including the non-traditional one more favorably than those who characterized themselves as feminine sex-typed, masculine sex-typed, or undifferentiated. Masculine sex-typed males were most likely to hold negative attitudes toward women in any occupation, and particularly toward women in non-traditional occupations. Implications of results for occupational choice among college students were discussed.

Men and women in our society have been perceived differently, and the pervasiveness of sex-role stereotyping is well documented. Personality characteristics held appropriate for men have not been considered appropriate for women (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman 1968; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972), and those held to describe the healthy adult tended to be those appropriate for men. Although there were variations in other studies (Lunneborg, 1970; Seward, 1946; Fernberger, 1948; Komarovsky, 1950; McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953), a high degree of consensus regarding characteristics differentially attributed to men and women was evident.

Perceptions of women in non-traditional roles have tended to be unfavorable (Herman & Sedlacek, 1973; Shuman & Sedlacek, 1977), as have attitudes toward women who have been successful in non-traditional situations (Courtois & Sedlacek, 1975).

Research on the perception of women in non-traditional occupations, however, has indicated that women were perceived differently under different circumstances. High school counselors were found to be as accepting of women with non-traditional goals as they were of those with traditional goals, even though they perceived non-traditional career goals as less appropriate than traditional ones (Thomas & Stewart, 1971). However, college counselors have been found to show more bias against women pursuing non-traditional career goals (Schlossberg & Pietrofesa, 1973). Shinar (1978) concluded that the sex-appropriateness of the occupation played an important role in the way the person in the occupation was perceived, with women viewing those in masculine occupations, both males and females, more positively than those in feminine occupations. Research which found that women

did not tend to align with the highly valued characteristics of the adult suggested that women in non-traditional roles or occupations would experience conflict between identification with masculine aspects of the profession and those characteristics of a feminine self-concept (Broverman et al, 1972). Feulner (1974), however, found the professional sphere to have more influence than the stereotypic one for women in law, medicine, and higher education, therefore enhancing their self-concept instead of providing a source of conflict. These inconsistent findings regarding the perception of women in non-traditional occupations by themselves and others have not been clearly explained, but they may be accounted for by another variable which influences both person perception and self-perception.

Bem (1975) found men and women whose self-perception was sex-typed to have greater difficulty engaging in cross-sexed behavior than men and women who perceived themselves as having both masculine and feminine characteristics, i.e., androgynous self-concepts. Since men who were masculine and women who were feminine sex-typed in their self-concepts had more difficulty with cross-sexed behavior, they were also likely to be less accepting of such behavior in others; particularly feminine women, who appeared to be the most restricted in Bem's results. Men and women whose sex-role identity was androgynous could also be expected to be more accepting of cross-sexed behavior in others.

The purposes of the present study were to: (1) develop an instrument for measuring attitudes toward women in non-traditional occupations; (2) determine the extent to which college students differentially evaluated women in traditional, non-traditional, and unspecified occupations; and (3) determine if sex-role identification was a variable moderating the attitudes of students toward the

kinds of occupations women selected.

Method

Instrumentation

The Situational Attitude Scale was originally developed by Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) to measure racial bias. Adapted versions have been used to measure sex-role bias (Herman and Sedlacek, 1973; Courtois and Sedlacek, 1975; Shueman and Sedlacek, 1977; Minatoya and Sedlacek, 1980), age bias (Celio, Sedlacek, and Schlossberg, 1977; Peabody and Sedlacek, 1982), and racial attitudes related to economic and educational opportunity (Minatoya and Sedlacek, 1979). The Situational Attitude Scale for Women in Occupations (SASW-OC), developed to measure attitudes toward women who work, placed women in 10 occupational situations (see Table 1). Three forms of the instrument identified the women as being in either as unspecified occupation (Form A), a traditional occupation (Form B), or a non-traditional occupation (Form C). Subjects responded to 10 five-point bipolar word scales associated with each situation. In order to increase comparability across situations, each situation used the same set of bipolar word scales. The polarity of the items was randomly varied within situations, and the order of the word scales varied across situations to reduce response set. All three forms were identical except for occupational designation. The SASW-OC differed from other SAS instruments. Instead of varying the race, sex, or age of the person in the situation, the occupation associated with the person was varied.

Occupational titles for the SASW-OC were selected from the list of occupations rated by undergraduate students as masculine, feminine, or neutral (Shinar, 1975). Examination of the list yielded two important observations.

First, the majority of occupations were perceived as masculine, a perception supported by Labor Department statistics of the number of occupations in which women were in a minority (Women's Bureau, 1975). Second, those occupations that were perceived as feminine were lower in status than those considered masculine or neutral. Thus it was difficult to present occupational identifications that were clearly perceived as masculine or feminine, and at the same time control for such variables as occupational level and prestige. For the purposes of this study, therefore, non-traditional occupations included those that represented neutral as well as feminine occupations, and/or titles which Labor Department (Women's Bureau, 1975) statistics indicated had a large proportion of women. Since the main focus of the study was on differential perceptions of women in non-traditional occupations, it was assumed that acceptance of women into neutral occupations meant that the occupation was appropriate for women. Occupational level was at the professional or semi-professional level.

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) measured self-concept with respect to masculinity, femininity, or androgyny as a function of a person's endorsement of masculine and feminine personality characteristics. Subjects were asked to rate themselves on each of 60 personality characteristics (20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral) according to a 7-point scale ranging from "never or almost never true" to "always or almost always true." The BSRI was scored using the median split method (Bem, 1977), yielding four designations. Masculine subjects rated themselves high on masculine and low on feminine characteristics. Feminine subjects rated themselves high on feminine and low on masculine characteristics. Androgynous subjects rated themselves high on both masculine and feminine characteristics. Undifferentiated subjects rated themselves low on both characteristics.

Subjects and Analyses

The SASW-OC and the BSRI were administered to a representative sample of 156 incoming freshmen during orientation at the University of Maryland, College Park. Classification of subjects on the BSRI yielded four usable sex-role designations: masculine males (N=25), feminine females (N=25), androgynous subjects (N=37), and undifferentiated subjects (N=37). Masculine-typed females (N=10) and feminine-typed males (N=8) were eliminated from the sample because of small cell sizes, as were subjects for whom data from both instruments were not complete (N=15). Analyses were conducted on a final sample of 124 subjects. The sample was 45% male and 55% female. Data were analyzed by a fixed effects two-way analysis of variance, with form and role as main effects, with Student Newman-Keuls post-hoc tests at the .05 level.

Results

Results indicated 18 items significantly different on role, 12 items significantly different on form, and 4 items significantly different on the interaction of form and role (Table 2). Since only 9 out of 100 items would be expected to be significantly different by chance (Sakoda, Cohen & Beall, 1954), the main effects for form and role were significant at a level above chance.

Occupational Design

There were four situations (Situation II, III, IV, IX) which showed significant differences in attitudes toward women in occupations (main effect for form). In each of these situations, women in non-traditional occupations were viewed less favorably than women in traditional occupations or where no occupation was designated. Since mean ratings on the form which designated no occupation were similar to that which designated a traditional occupation, results for the

neutral form will only be discussed in those instances where the response was significantly different from the traditional occupational form.

In situation II, a women supervising a sporting goods department at a major retail store was considered significantly more masculine and unreliable by all subjects than was a women supervising a women's clothing department. Masculine sex-typed males seemed to be least favorable toward women in this role, and were significantly more likely to view the situation as bad than were androgynous students.

Results for situation III indicated mixed views toward a woman heading a university department. The woman chairing an engineering department was seen as more assertive but less feminine than the woman who heads an education department.

Situation IV elicited the largest number of significantly different responses on occupational designation. In this situation, a woman at a cocktail party was engaged in conversation about her work as either an architect (non-traditional) or a fashion designer (traditional). Students tended to view the woman architect as less feminine and less sensitive than the fashion designer. However, the woman fashion designer was viewed as the most assertive of the three designations. This situation also presented the single instance where the woman in an unspecified occupation was viewed in a significantly different way. Both the woman architect and fashion designer were seen as significantly more active than the woman in an unspecified occupation.

Results were clearest for situation IX in which a woman pilot was viewed as bad and weak in comparison to a woman stewardess.

Sex-Role Differences

Main effects for sex-role were significant on 18 items across 10 situations (I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X). A consistent pattern of significant differences between masculine sex-typed males and androgynous students was

evident across situations. Masculine sex-typed males were significantly less favorable in their attitudes toward women in occupations than were androgynous students on 11 items.

In situation III, masculine sex-typed males viewed a woman department head at a university as significantly less reliable than she was viewed by undifferentiated students, feminine sex-typed women students, or androgynous students. Masculine males also tended to be more negative about such a department head, and were more likely to view her as unacceptable, bad, or weak. Androgynous students, on the other hand, were open to a woman in such a position, and viewed her as acceptable and reliable.

Masculine males tended to view a woman counseling professional (situation IV) as less reliable and less acceptable than androgynous students. They tended to view a high school worker (situation VII) as less feminine than either undifferentiated students, androgynous students or feminine sex-typed women students. Masculine males also tended to view the woman on a flight to Europe (situation IX) as less feminine and inadequate. A woman who postpones childbearing (situation X) was unacceptable and inadequate to the masculine sex-typed male, while androgynous students found such a woman both acceptable and adequate.

Discussion

The results of this study were similar to other studies measuring attitudes toward women in non-traditional situations (Herman & Sedlacek, 1973; Courtois & Sedlacek, 1975; Minatoya & Sedlacek, 1980). Women in non-traditional occupations were seen as unfeminine, insensitive, weak, or bad. Additionally, they were viewed as assertive and active.

Masculine sex-typed males tended to be at least favorably disposed to women

in any occupation, and androgynous subjects (both males and females) tended to be the most favorable. Masculine sex-typed males tended to be even less favorable toward women in non-traditional occupations than they were to women in traditional or unspecified occupations. To the extent that women in any occupation engaged in atypical behavior for their sex, and to the extent that attitudes measured in this study reflected acceptance or rejection of cross-sex behavior, the results of this study supported Bem's (1975) theory regarding the relationship of cross-sex behavior and sex-role identity as it pertains to masculine sex-typed males.

Androgynous students were more open to such cross-sex behavior and to persons who engaged in it. Androgynous students (both males and females) viewed women in any occupation and those in non-traditional occupations the most favorable of the sex-role designations.

The data were less consistent for feminine sex-role women subjects. In Bem's research, feminine sex-typed women were as restricted in their openness to cross-sex behavior as masculine sex-typed males. They were, therefore, expected to respond with negative attitudes toward women who engaged in such behavior. Feminine sex-typed women were more ambivalent in their attitudes toward the behavior of other women, rather than clearly aligning with their male counterparts. They were less favorable (although not significantly different statistically) than androgynous or undifferentiated students in some situations. For instance, feminine sex-typed women viewed a female counseling professional as less acceptable and less reliable, and a woman who postponed childbearing as less adequate and unacceptable. And while the mean ratings for the feminine sex-typed women tended to rank next to their male counterparts, there were also numerous instances where their responses were most like those

of the androgynous students. For example, a woman speaker was considered adequate and acceptable. And while the feminine sex-typed woman was guarded and cautious in her acceptance of a woman chairing a university department, she also viewed such a woman as good and strong.

Results of this study indicated that sex-role identifications may have been a relevant variable in understanding the attitudes of students toward women in traditional and non-traditional occupations. Women in non-traditional occupations were viewed less favorably than those identified with traditional ones. Students with an androgynous self-concept, those who acknowledged both masculine and feminine traits, were most likely to view women in any occupation, including non-traditional ones, favorably, while masculine sex-typed students were least likely to do so.

Implications for Career Development

These results suggested two implications for working with college students on choosing a career. First, since sex-role orientation seemed to influence the attitudes of women toward the occupational choice of other women, it would seem to have impact also on a woman's own occupational choice. Indeed, recent research has found sex-role attitudes to relate to choice of traditional versus non-traditional majors (Lyson & Brown, 1982; Yanico, 1981) and choice of male dominant occupations (Yanico, 1981) among women. It has also been found to relate to stereotypic perceptions of occupations as sex-typed (Yanico, 1982; Clarey & Sanford, 1982).

The androgynous women in the present study were most open to non-traditional roles for other women, but feminine sex-typed women were ambivalent. Such results suggest that broadening the sex-role orientation of women may be a vital task of the educational process if women students are to explore all the career options for which they may have talents and abilities. This is particularly

important for the feminine sex-typed woman who has narrowed the diversity of acceptable roles for herself and other women.

Second, the attitudes of male peers have been shown to influence the career choice of women. Hawley (1971) found that women's career choice may be influenced by their perceptions of men's attitudes toward gender appropriate behavior. Masculine sex-typed males in the present study were clearly negative in their attitudes toward non-traditional occupational choices among women. Androgynous males, on the other hand, were open to a diversity of career options for women. The attitudes of peers are certainly an important influence on women students during the college years. Broadening the sex-role orientation of males would also seem to be an important part of the educational process.

The cultural barriers to women in non-traditional occupations almost seem to begin in infancy. Socialization of sex-appropriate behaviors for both males and females begins very early, and are reinforced at every stage of development. How much attitudes can be changed during four years of college is unclear. What is clear is that the academic environment must be conducive to opening students to new horizons on every front if it is to meet its obligations to the educational process.

References

Bem, S. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31 (4), 634-643.

Bem, S. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing Psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 196-205.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. (1970). Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current reappraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.

Celio, M.B., Sedlacek, W.E., Schlossberg, N.K. (1977). The development of a measure of attitudes toward age. Counseling Center Research Report #8-77, University of Maryland.

Clarey, J.H. & Sanford, A. (1982). Female career preference and androgyny. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, (March), 30 (3), 258-264.

Courtois, C. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1975). Sex differences in perceptions of female success. Counseling Center Research Report #2-75, University of Maryland.

Fernberger, S.W. (1948). Persistence of stereotypes concerning sex differences. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 43, 97-101.

Feulner, P.R. (1974). Women in the professions: A social psychological study. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (8-A, p.T-2) 5309.

Hawley, P. (1971). What do women think: Does it affect their career choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 193-199

Herman, M.H. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1973). Sexist attitudes among male university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 14, 544-548.

Komarovsky, M. (1950). Functional analyses of sex roles. American Sociological Review, 15, 508-516.

Lunneborg, P.W. (1970). Stereotypic aspects of masculinity-femininity measurement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 113-118.

Lyson, T.A. & Brown, S.S. (1982). Sex role attitudes, curriculum choice, and career ambition: A comparison between women in typical and atypical college majors. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 20 (3), 366-375.

McKee, J.P. & Sherriffs, A.C. (1959). Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 64, 356-363.

Minatoya, L.Y. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1979). Attitudes of whites toward blacks: A revision of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). Counseling Center Research Report #7-79, University of Maryland.

Minatoya, L.Y. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1980). The SASW: A measure of sexism among university freshmen. Counseling Center Research Report #12-80, University of Maryland.

Peabody, S.A. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1982). Attitudes of younger university students toward older students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 140-143.

Rosenkrantz, P.S., Vogel. S.R., Bee, H., Broverman, I.K., & Broverman, D.M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 287-295.

Sakoda, J.M., Cohen, B., & Beall, G. (1954). Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 51 172-175.

Schlossberg, N.K. & Pietrofesa, J. (1973). Perspectives on counseling bias: Implications for counselor education. The Counseling Psychologist, 4, 44-54.

Sedlacek, W.E.& Brooks, G.C. (1972). Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual. Chicago: Natresources, Inc.

Seward, G.H. (1946). Sex and the social order. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sherriffs, A.C. & Jarrett, R.F. (1953). Sex differences in attitudes about sex differences. Journal of Psychology, 35, 161-168.

Shinar, E.H. (1975). Sexual stereotypes of occupations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 7, 99-111.

Shinar, E.H. (1978). Person perception as a function of occupation and sex. Sex Roles, 4 (5), 679-693.

Shueman, S.A. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1977). Measuring sexist attitudes in a situational context. Counseling Center Research Report #16-77, University of Maryland.

Thomas, A.H. & Steward, N.R. (1971). Counselor response to female clients with deviate and conforming career goals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18 (4), 352-357.

Women's Bureau. 1975 Handbook on Women Workers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Yanico, B.J. (1981). Sex role self concept and attitudes related to occupational daydreams and future fantasies of college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 19 (3), 290-301.

Yanico, B.J. (1982). Androgyny and occupational sex stereotyping of college students. Psychological Reports, 50 (3), 875-878.

Table 1.

INSTRUCTIONS AND SITUATIONS FROM THE S.A.S.W.-OC.

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous, so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your ta: is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date.

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you mi; select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you will feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS From the S.A.S.W.-OC.

FORM A

I. Margaret works at a large metropolital hospital.

II. Karen has recently been promoted to a supervisory position at a major retail store where she works.

III. Helen Murray has just been named head of a department at the university you attend.

IV. You are referred to Mary for counseling.

V. A friend asks you to attend a meeting to hear a young woman speak.

VI. At a cocktail party, you talk with Susan for hours about her work.

VII. Barbara, from your son's high school, calls to arrange a conference about your work with the P.T.A.

VIII. Your friend, Christina, offers to help with your income taxes.

IX. As you board your flight to Europe, you discover a woman whom you recently met.

X. Your neighbor, Jane, has decided to postpone having children.

FORM B

I. Margaret works as a nurse at a large metropolitan hospital.

II. Karen has recently been promoted to a supervisory position in the women's clothing department at a major retail store where she works.

III. Helen Murray has just been named head of the education department at the university you attend.

IV. You are referred to Mary, a social worker, for counseling.

V. A friend asks you to attend a meeting to hear a young women missionary speak.

VI. At a cocktail party, you talk with Susan for hours about her work as a fashion designer.

VII. Barbara, a teacher from you son's high school, calls to arrange a conference about your work with the P.T.A.

VIII. Your friend, Christina, who is a bookkeeper, offers to help with your income taxes.

IX. As you board your flight for Europe, you discover a woman whom you recently met will be your stewardess.

X. You neighbor, Jane, has decided to postpone having children to study ballet.

FORM C

I. Margaret works as a physician at a large metropolitan hospital.

II. Karen has recently been promoted to a supervisory position in the sporting goods department at a major retail store where she works.

III. Helen Murray has just been named head of the engineering department at the university you attend.

IV. You are referred to Mary, a psychiatrist, for counseling.

V. A friend asks you to attend a meeting to hear a young woman minister speak.

VI. At a cocktail party, you talk with Susan for hours about her work as an architect.

VII. Barbara, the principal from your son's high school, calls to arrange a conference about your work with the P.T.A.

VIII. Your friend, Christina, who is an accountant, offers to help with your income taxes.

IX. As you board your flight for Europe, you discover a woman whom you recently met will be your pilot.

X. Your neighbor, Jane, has decided to postpone having children to go to law school.

Table 2.

Mean Attitudes by Sex-Role and by Occupation (Form)* (N=124)

Item #, situation, and item content **	Masculine Male			Feminine Female			Androgynous			Undifferentiated			Significant at .05***
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
I. Physician/nurse large hospital													
1. assertive/yielding	1.33	1.75	2.00	1.67	1.63	1.00	1.29	1.64	1.11	1.30	1.41	.70	
2. feminine/masculine	1.33	1.13	2.25	1.33	.88	.80	1.50	1.07	1.33	1.40	1.24	1.60	
3. passive/active	3.11	3.00	3.13	3.42	3.13	2.20	3.14	3.07	3.22	2.60	2.71	3.20	
4. adequate/inadequate	1.11	1.13	1.25	.50	.50	.80	.86	.71	1.00	.50	1.35	.50	
5. bad/good	3.67	2.63	2.75	3.75	3.50	2.40	3.43	3.07	2.78	3.00	3.29	3.60	
6. weak/strong	2.89	2.88	2.63	3.08	2.63	3.00	3.36	2.86	3.44	3.20	2.71	3.40	F
7. insensitive/sensitive	2.44	2.38	2.25	3.17	3.13	3.00	2.93	2.71	2.78	2.70	2.76	2.50	
8. guarded/open	2.44	2.50	2.00	1.75	1.88	2.40	2.79	2.43	2.56	2.20	2.24	2.20	R
9. unacceptable/acceptable	2.89	2.88	2.88	3.25	3.50	2.40	3.00	3.14	3.22	3.10	3.12	3.30	
10. reliable/unreliable	1.00	1.63	.88	.50	.13	.60	.86	.43	.78	.60	.94	.30	R
II. Department supervisor, retail store													
11. feminine/masculine	2.11	1.38	2.75	1.83	.50	2.00	1.57	1.14	2.00	1.40	1.35	2.10	F
12. strong/weak	1.22	1.00	1.13	.42	1.25	1.40	1.36	1.07	1.11	1.00	1.18	.90	
13. sensitive/insensitive	2.00	2.75	1.50	1.50	1.88	2.20	2.29	1.64	1.78	1.60	1.53	1.90	RXF
14. adequate/inadequate	1.11	.75	1.25	.58	.63	1.40	.50	.86	.56	.70	.76	.70	
15. active/passive	.44	1.13	1.13	.25	.75	1.40	.43	.36	.56	.90	.88	.80	
16. yielding/assertive	3.33	2.50	2.50	3.58	2.75	2.00	3.29	3.14	2.44	2.40	2.88	2.80	
17. guarded/open	1.89	1.63	2.13	1.92	1.25	2.40	2.57	2.00	1.78	2.00	1.82	2.30	
18. reliable/unreliable	1.00	1.25	1.13	.75	.50	1.40	.64	.29	.67	.90	.65	1.50	F
19. good/bad	1.78	1.00	1.25	.67	1.00	1.20	.71	.36	.78	.90	.65	1.10	R
20. acceptable/unacceptable	1.00	1.13	1.50	.58	1.00	.40	.93	.50	1.00	.80	.65	1.10	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.

Mean Attitudes by Sex-Role and by Occupation (Form)* (N=124)

Item #, situation, and item content **	Masculine Male			Feminine Female			Androgynous			Undifferentiated			Significant at .05***
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
. University department head													
. unacceptable/acceptable	2.56	1.38	2.13	2.75	2.25	2.60	3.50	3.07	3.56	3.10	2.71	2.70	R
. sensitive/insensitive	1.67	2.38	2.25	1.58	1.88	2.00	1.57	1.50	1.89	1.50	1.77	2.00	
. good/bad	.89	2.63	1.50	.50	1.25	1.20	1.29	.36	1.11	1.20	1.00	.80	R,RXF
. passive/active	3.33	2.50	3.00	3.75	1.88	1.80	2.93	3.29	3.56	2.90	2.94	2.90	RXF
. assertive/yielding	.67	1.63	1.63	.42	1.50	.60	.71	1.36	.56	1.00	1.00	1.10	F
. feminine/masculine	1.89	2.13	2.63	1.75	1.25	2.20	2.00	1.29	1.56	1.30	1.59	2.60	F
. adequate/inadequate	.78	1.50	1.50	.25	.88	1.20	.57	.79	.11	.50	.65	1.00	
. strong/weak	1.22	1.75	1.38	.33	1.00	.80	1.29	.93	.78	1.00	.88	1.10	R
. open/guarded	2.00	2.38	2.00	1.50	1.63	1.80	1.29	1.21	1.44	2.10	1.41	2.20	R
. reliable/unreliable	1.00	1.88	1.50	.25	.50	1.60	.43	.43	.22	1.30	.94	1.40	R
. Counseling													
. weak/strong	1.78	2.13	2.00	2.33	1.63	2.20	2.14	2.64	3.00	2.40	2.59	1.90	
. insensitive/sensitive	2.56	2.25	3.13	2.92	2.75	3.20	2.71	3.14	1.44	2.70	3.06	1.70	
. inadequate/adequate	2.00	1.75	2.75	2.33	2.50	3.20	3.00	2.93	2.67	3.10	2.59	2.20	
. masculine/feminine	2.44	2.63	2.75	2.50	3.25	2.80	2.36	2.43	2.78	2.90	2.00	1.70	R
. acceptable/unacceptable	1.56	1.63	2.00	1.42	1.63	1.00	1.00	.57	1.11	.70	.94	1.30	
. passive/active	2.67	2.00	1.88	2.42	1.13	2.20	2.36	2.14	2.56	2.00	2.76	2.00	
. reliable/unreliable	1.44	2.00	1.50	1.42	.88	.80	.79	1.00	.78	.90	.71	1.20	R
. open/guarded	1.22	1.88	1.00	1.67	1.38	.80	.86	1.00	.89	1.50	1.29	1.80	
. bad/good	2.44	1.50	2.88	2.50	2.88	2.60	3.00	2.86	2.89	2.90	2.88	2.20	
. yielding/assertive	2.00	1.88	2.00	2.58	2.13	1.60	2.29	2.64	2.56	1.30	2.23	2.00	

Table 2.

Mean Attitudes by Sex-Role and by Occupation (Form)* (N=124)

Item #, situation, and item content **	Masculine Male			Feminine Female			Androgynous			Undifferentiated			Significant at .05***
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
V. Young woman speaker													
41. unreliable/reliable	2.33	1.25	1.50	2.33	2.75	1.80	2.36	2.43	2.11	2.40	1.82	2.20	
42. open/guarded	1.44	2.00	1.75	1.08	.75	1.40	1.43	1.29	1.56	1.60	1.29	1.30	
43. strong/weak	1.67	1.88	1.75	1.67	1.00	1.40	2.00	1.36	1.78	1.30	1.70	1.30	
44. inadequate/adequate	2.33	1.63	1.50	2.67	3.00	2.80	1.86	2.50	1.44	2.20	1.94	2.30	R
45. masculine/feminine	2.00	1.63	1.75	3.00	2.25	2.20	2.00	2.43	2.00	2.80	2.18	1.70	
46. assertive/yielding	1.00	1.38	2.00	1.33	1.50	2.20	1.50	1.29	1.22	1.30	1.47	1.00	
47. passive/active	2.44	1.88	1.75	2.58	2.13	2.00	2.36	2.79	3.33	3.00	2.65	2.30	
48. bad/good	2.11	2.00	1.88	2.67	3.25	1.80	2.21	2.79	2.67	2.80	2.35	2.20	
49. insensitive/sensitive	2.44	1.75	1.88	2.33	2.50	1.20	2.07	2.86	2.89	2.30	1.65	2.80	RXF
50. unacceptable/acceptable	2.22	2.13	1.00	2.67	2.75	2.20	2.43	2.50	2.44	2.70	1.29	1.70	R
VI. Cocktail party conversation													
51. active/passive	1.56	1.13	1.38	1.75	.13	1.00	1.57	.29	1.22	2.10	1.24	.80	F
52. yielding/assertive	2.33	2.25	2.13	2.25	3.00	2.40	2.14	3.35	3.11	1.90	2.41	2.70	F
53. good/bad	1.44	1.63	1.88	1.42	1.38	.80	1.64	.64	.89	1.10	1.18	1.20	
54. sensitive/insensitive	1.00	1.13	2.13	.92	2.13	2.80	1.36	1.00	1.67	1.50	1.65	1.70	F
55. weak/strong	2.78	2.13	2.38	2.50	2.88	2.00	2.21	2.86	2.11	2.20	2.41	2.40	
56. acceptable/unacceptable	1.56	1.13	1.38	1.25	1.25	1.20	1.14	.79	.89	1.20	1.47	1.20	
57. adequate/inadequate	1.22	1.75	1.63	1.00	1.13	1.00	1.93	1.00	1.56	1.10	1.06	.50	R
58. passive/active	2.44	2.13	2.00	1.83	2.50	3.00	1.86	2.64	3.44	2.20	2.53	2.70	F
59. open/guarded	1.33	1.50	1.75	1.50	1.25	2.20	1.43	1.07	.78	1.50	1.65	1.60	
60. masculine/feminine	2.00	2.38	2.00	3.08	2.88	2.40	1.57	2.93	2.56	2.60	2.94	2.00	F

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.

Mean Attitudes by Sex-Role and by Occupation (Form)* (N=124)

Item #, situation, and item content **	Masculine Male			Feminine Female			Androgynous			Undifferentiated			Significant at .05***
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
VII. High school conference													
61. assertive/yielding	1.00	.88	2.00	.92	1.88	1.00	1.00	.86	.33	.80	.94	1.70	
62. feminine/masculine	2.56	2.50	2.25	1.50	.63	1.20	1.57	1.07	2.11	1.10	1.88	2.10	R
63. active/passive	1.44	1.88	2.00	.67	1.13	1.60	1.57	.57	.89	1.00	1.12	1.80	
64. inadequate/adequate	2.89	2.25	2.13	2.83	3.00	2.40	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.90	2.35	1.90	
65. good/bad	1.33	1.88	1.38	1.58	1.25	1.20	1.36	.86	1.22	.80	1.41	1.90	
66. weak/strong	2.33	2.63	1.88	2.67	2.00	2.80	2.64	2.57	2.89	2.30	2.47	2.50	
67. sensitive/insensitive	1.67	1.63	1.88	1.58	1.00	1.60	1.57	.93	1.11	1.40	1.18	1.70	
68. reliable/unreliable	1.33	2.13	1.88	.92	.88	1.00	1.50	.79	1.00	.80	1.65	1.50	
69. acceptable/unacceptable	1.44	2.00	1.50	1.25	1.00	.80	1.50	.57	.56	1.00	1.06	1.30	
70. open/guarded	1.33	1.75	2.13	1.42	2.00	1.20	1.86	1.21	.22	1.90	1.53	1.60	
VIII. Help with income taxes													
71. acceptable/unacceptable	1.33	1.25	1.13	.58	.50	.80	1.36	.50	.22	.60	.94	.80	
72. bad/good	2.56	2.50	2.75	3.42	3.75	2.80	2.36	3.36	3.89	3.10	2.88	2.70	
73. unreliable/reliable	2.11	3.13	2.00	3.08	2.88	3.00	2.64	3.14	3.22	2.80	3.00	2.90	
74. open/guarded	1.11	1.75	1.13	1.00	1.75	1.00	1.36	1.36	.78	1.50	1.29	1.70	
75. assertive/yielding	1.78	1.88	1.63	1.42	2.13	1.60	1.64	.93	1.56	1.70	1.76	1.60	
76. passive/active	2.67	2.38	2.38	2.58	2.50	2.40	2.57	2.64	2.33	2.50	2.29	3.20	
77. inadequate/adequate	2.33	2.50	2.63	3.17	2.75	2.40	2.21	3.21	2.67	2.90	2.76	2.70	
78. masculine/feminine	2.22	2.25	1.63	2.92	2.13	2.00	2.21	2.29	2.11	2.60	2.18	2.60	
79. strong/weak	1.44	2.13	1.38	1.59	1.75	1.80	1.92	1.60	1.56	1.50	1.76	1.30	
80. insensitive/sensitive	2.33	2.38	2.50	2.83	2.75	2.40	2.29	2.71	2.67	2.50	2.53	2.40	

19.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.

Mean Attitudes by Sex-Role and by Occupation (Form)* (N=124)

Item #, situation, and item content **	Masculine Male			Feminine Female			Androgynous			Undifferentiated			Significant at .05***
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
IX. Flight to Europe													
81. reliable/unreliable	1.22	1.88	1.75	1.58	1.13	1.20	1.64	.79	.78	1.20	.94	1.20	
82. open/guarded	1.33	1.63	2.38	1.33	1.38	2.00	1.79	1.07	1.56	1.50	1.47	.80	
83. weak/strong	2.67	2.63	1.13	2.58	2.25	2.40	2.50	2.57	2.44	2.60	2.53	1.80	F
84. adequate/inadequate	1.78	1.63	2.13	1.25	.75	1.20	1.43	.71	.78	1.20	1.53	1.50	R
85. masculine/feminine	1.33	2.00	1.25	2.92	3.00	2.40	1.86	2.86	2.22	2.80	2.24	1.90	R
86. yielding/assertive	2.56	2.25	2.13	2.17	2.38	1.40	2.00	2.93	2.78	2.70	2.29	2.50	
87. active/passive	1.22	1.13	2.00	1.58	1.25	1.80	1.86	1.14	1.00	1.10	1.12	1.20	
88. bad/good	3.00	3.00	1.25	2.75	2.25	1.60	2.29	2.93	2.67	2.80	2.18	1.70	F
89. insensitive/sensitive	2.22	2.13	1.88	2.83	2.37	2.40	1.93	2.79	2.33	2.60	2.53	1.60	
90. acceptable/unacceptable	1.00	1.75	2.25	1.08	.88	1.20	1.64	1.14	1.22	.80	.94	1.70	
X. Postponing childbearing													
91. yielding/assertive	2.00	2.13	1.25	1.50	3.00	3.00	1.93	2.00	3.33	1.80	2.24	1.90	
92. good/bad	1.78	2.50	1.38	1.75	2.00	1.20	1.86	1.36	1.22	1.40	1.59	1.20	
93. open/closed	1.56	1.50	1.63	1.08	1.88	1.20	1.64	1.43	1.33	.80	1.00	1.20	
94. unreliable/reliable	2.00	2.50	1.50	2.00	2.25	2.80	2.50	2.86	3.00	2.90	1.76	2.50	
95. passive/active	1.78	2.38	1.75	2.08	2.88	2.60	2.36	2.36	2.89	2.50	2.47	2.70	
96. unacceptable/acceptable	1.89	1.88	2.00	2.58	2.25	2.40	2.93	3.21	3.44	2.60	1.94	3.30	R
97. feminine/masculine	1.78	1.75	1.50	.92	1.38	1.60	2.07	.93	1.33	1.40	1.76	1.90	
98. inadequate/adequate	1.89	1.50	1.88	2.33	2.00	2.20	2.79	2.79	2.78	2.10	1.82	2.80	R
99. sensitive/insensitive	1.44	2.63	1.13	1.42	1.50	2.60	1.29	1.64	1.44	1.60	1.88	.90	
100. strong/weak	1.89	1.13	1.13	1.25	1.25	.60	1.79	1.00	.78	1.10	1.00	1.50	

* Scale = 0 to 4

** See Table 1 for complete situation

*** R = role, F = form, RXF = role by form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE